

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JOHN WALSH, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAURE WALSH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:CV-15-1103

(JUDGE CAPUTO)

(MAGISTRATE JUDGE CARLSON)

ORDER

NOW, this 13th day of August, 2015, upon review of the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson (Doc. 3) for plain error or manifest injustice, Plaintiff's Notice of Appeal Concerning Writ of Stay for Marital Assets (Doc. 4),¹ and Plaintiff's Complaint seeking a "writ of stay, concerning martial [sic] assets" (Doc. 1), **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- (1) The Report & Recommendation (Doc. 3) is **ADOPTED**.
- (2) The Complaint (Doc. 1) is **DISMISSED with prejudice**.
- (3) The Clerk of Court is directed to mark the case as **CLOSED**.


A. Richard Caputo
United States District Judge

¹ Where objections to the Magistrate Judge's report are filed, the court must conduct a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n.3 (3d Cir. 1989) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). However, this only applies to the extent that a party's objections are both timely and specific. *Goney v. Clark*, 749 F.2d 5, 6-7 (3d Cir. 1984). Because the Objections do not address Magistrate Judge Carlson's stated reasons for recommending dismissal of the action, the Report and Recommendation has been reviewed for clear error or manifest injustice. *See, e.g., Cruz v. Chater*, 990 F. Supp. 375, 376-77 (M.D. Pa. 1998).